

## REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on October 7, 2005.

Claims 1-19, 23, 24, 26, and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. (US 2004/0253478 A1). According to the examiner, the provisional application 60/457,012 filed prior to application 10/807,738, which is US publication 2004/0253478, is considered to support an obviousness rejection. Thompson et al. teaches emissive layers of an organic light emitting device may contain a meal complex according to the formula in the Abstract and in paragraph [0013].

It is submitted that the cited US 2004/0253478 is not entitled to the March 24, 2003 filing date of the provisional with respect to the formula of the abstract. Enclosed herewith is a copy of the original Provisional Application printed off of the PTO Web Site. Applicants have been unable to find the formula of the Abstract and claims anywhere in the provisional application. At best, the formula of the cited publication is entitled to its actual filing date of March 24, 2004, which is after the filing date of the present application. The only reference to a pyrazole in the provisional application appears to be in the list of compounds just preceding the Examples under Ir(ppz)<sub>3</sub>.

The enclosed Declaration of Joseph C. Deaton serves to compare the emission results of the Ir(ppz)<sub>3</sub> compound to that of the present invention containing a fused ring on the pyrazole ring. This Declaration demonstrates that the emissions afforded by the presence of the fused ring are improved several fold over that obtained using Ir(ppz)<sub>3</sub> and the colors are at variance. It is believed that the claimed OLED device containing an Ir phenylpyrazole/fused ring ligand is unexpectedly superior to the corresponding emitter absent the fused ring.

In view of the foregoing comparative data and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-2625  
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Encl: Declaration of Joseph C. Deaton  
Provisional 60/457,012